



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/727,535 | 12/04/2000 | Kiyomi Nakamura | 503.39364X00 | 4344 |

20457 7590 07/16/2003

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
SUITE 1800
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

IP, SIKYIN

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

1742

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003

19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| | | | |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| SERIAL NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED APPLICANT | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
| 09/127535 | | | |

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| EXAMINER | |
| | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | 19 |

DATE MAILED:

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

☒ THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

a) ☒ is extended to run _____ or continues to run 3 months from the date of the final rejection

b) ☐ expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

☐ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).

☒ Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed 7/9/03 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1. ☐ The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:

- a. ☐ There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
- b. ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
- c. ☐ They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).
- d. ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
- e. ☐ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

2. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

3. ☒ Upon the filing an appeal, the response ~~proposed amendment~~ ☒ will be entered ☐ will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:

Claims allowed: 28-30, 34-39

Claims objected to: _____

Claims rejected: 1-11, 22-23, 26, 27, 31-33

However;

☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): _____

4. ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because of reasons set forth in pages No. 17. Applicants agree that instant Figure 4 shows the claimed Sn content critical. But Fig 4 compares samples with
5. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented.

☐ The proposed drawing correction ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the examiner.

☐ Other *Sn to no Sn. But alloys of DE 1259578 contains Sn. Applicants argue that DE 1259578 relates to powder metallurgical manufacture of Mg

SIKYIN IP
PRIMARY EXAMINER

PTOL-303 (REV. 5-89) alloy. But the raw material composition is still overlapped the claimed %